

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

CASE NO.: 8:18-CV-00127

RYSTA LEONA SUSMAN, both individually and as Legal Guardian of SHANE ALLEN LOVELAND, et al.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

THE GOODYEAR TIRE & RUBBER COMPANY,

Defendant.

DEPOSITION OF

CRAIG H. LICHTBLAU, M.D.

Monday, April 8, 2019 4:49 p.m. - 6:41 p.m.

Offices of Craig H. Lichtblau, M.D. 550 Northlake Boulevard
North Palm Beach, Florida 33408

Stenographically Reported By: Shirley D. King, CRR, FPR, RPR Certified Realtime Reporter

20 So the way I put this together, in 1 2 answering your question, yes, some of this, it will 3 be consistent in other reports with neurologic catastrophic patients, but protocols change all the 4 5 time, medications change all the time. And depending upon the patient's clinical status, that 6 7 they may not have all sections of the specific report in it, in each report. 8 9 Ο. Okay. Thank you. 10 MR. HEDGER: Can I have this marked as Exhibit G. 11 12 THE WITNESS: Do you want to go off the 13 record? 14 MR. HEDGER: Sure. 15 (Marked for identification is Defense Exhibit G.) 16 17 BY MR. HEDGER: Sir, I've handed you what's been marked 18 Ο. Defendant's Exhibit G. Do you recognize that 19 20 document? 21 That's my summary report. 2.2 And you testified earlier that your Ο. 23 summary report is what exactly? 24 Α. It just adds life expectancy. You have to

use peer-reviewed published literature. And you'll

- notice I went ahead and reduced his life expectancy
 by four years, which you kind of have to because
 this is a major catastrophic injury. However, he is
 walking and he's not fit by a G-tube, so you'd only
 reduce it by four years. And this has basically
 been peer-reviewed published and accepted.
 - Q. All right. We'll get there. I'm going to start at the beginning of the report.
 - A. Okay.
 - Q. In the second paragraph, you say the patient's mother stated her son was in a normal state of health until May 1st, 2015. Do you see that in there?
 - A. Yes.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

- Q. Was this the sum total of your review of information pre-accident?
- A. I think so. Let's see. The accident took place on 5/1/15 and my first record is on 5/1/15. I think that's correct.
- I don't really have any knowledge of any preexisting bad problems that he had or medical problem. Let's see if it's in the past medical history.
- He had a fracture of his right foot.

 That's all I know. I don't think he had any

He'll hit somebody. He'll scream profanity at somebody's girlfriend and the boyfriend will hit him in the head, hit him with a tire iron or something. He can't be mixed in the regular population. He doesn't know what he's doing; can't be held accountable.

Q. So you referenced this already, but in the next paragraph it says, "There is a statistical reduction in life expectancy of patients who have suffered from a severe traumatic brain injury, and this estimated average life expectancy reduction is approximately four years."

Did I read that correctly?

A. Yes.

- Q. So this looks like an average. Why did you pick the average number of years?
- A. Because you can't go higher and you can't go lower. I'm saying, look, he's got a clinically significant reduction in life expectancy. And that's based on literature. I mean, I have 18 peer-reviewed published articles talking about life expectancy and traumatic brain injury. And some people say seven, some people say four, some people say less, some people say more. I would go with four years. And I think that's fair and reasonable

because he can walk, he can talk, he's not fed by a G-tube.

Now, if he was immobile in a bed and fed by a G-tube, it would be different, but he's walking.

- Q. Do these articles lay out sort of additional complications that would make the reduction in life expectancy higher?
- A. Yes, some of them do. If he was suffering from aspiration pneumonia, urinary tract infection, seizures, his mortality would be faster.
- Q. Do you know off the top of your head how much that would reduce his life expectancy?
 - A. No. No, I don't. And I wouldn't speculate in a court of law.

All I can say is, I'm going to concede in a court of law that he does have a reduction based on the fact that he had a severe traumatic brain injury and it's four years. That I'll concede to.

More than that or modifying that, I can't do that.

- O. Are you familiar with mortality tables?
- A. Yes.

2.2

Q. And sometimes mortality tables identify the risk of -- the risk of any one person dying in any one span of time. Are you familiar with how

okay with that. I think that that's legitimate.

- Q. Do you think that his risk of dying in any given year would be increased, as opposed to the general population?
- A. No. I think that I would go by the literature, and specifically, the National Research Counsel Summary Golf War and Health, Volume 7, Long-Term Consequences of Traumatic Brain Injury, Washington D.C. This is the National Academy of Press 2008. They said, based on their research -- and this is government funded. This is as good as it gets. They did this with our servicemen, veterans. They said, four years. I have no reason to disbelieve that, so that's what I'm going to go with. It's peer-reviewed, published, accepted. That's the best I can do.
 - Q. The next paragraph in your -- on page 7 of Exhibit G, which is your summary report, goes on to identify some increased risks that Mr. Loveland is exposed to because of his TBI. Do you see that?
 - A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. Can you identify for me what these increased -- what he's at an increased risk for?
- A. Yeah. Increased risk for traumatic brain induced epilepsy, Parkinsonism, Alzheimer's-like

dementia. So I agree, there are increased risks for all those thing, but I can't say it's more probable than not that he's going to have them.

2.2

- Q. If he does have -- if he does have any of these -- would you consider these complications or something separate from that?
- A. Yeah, they're a complication of a traumatic brain injury, but if you have Parkinson's, you control it with medications. And dementia-type doesn't mean Alzheimer's.

So I wouldn't say it's going to reduce his life expectancy anymore. I would just say it's going to make his life miserable.

- Q. So you don't see -- if you assume for the sake of argument that Mr. Loveland did experience traumatically-induced epilepsy, you see no drop in his life expectancy in the event that he does experience that complication?
- A. Well, no, it depends. It depends if he's getting appropriate aide and attendant care.

 Because if that's the case, then he would have to have RN and LPN level of care and they can put

 Diastat in his rectum, because they are allowed to pass meds, and they would have early detection and early intervention. However, if he doesn't have

early detection and early intervention, well then, yeah, you can reduce his life expectancy, because you can die from seizures.

Q. What about Parkinsonism?

2.2

- A. Well, that's not Parkinson's disease.

 Parkinsonism means that, you know, he has the shaking and the bradycardia slowness of gait and slowness of movement, masked face, yes.
- Q. If he ultimately suffers from that, would that impact his life expectancy?
- A. Probably not, not any more than the four years.
 - Q. What about Alzheimer's-like dementia?
- A. Again, that would just make taking care of him more complicated.
 - Q. But in your judgment, it wouldn't impact his life expectancy.
 - A. Well, it's going to impact his life expectancy due to the fact that he's going to reduce it by four years.
 - Q. You also go on to state that the brain injury that he suffered increases his potential to develop hydrocephalus in the future?
 - A. Correct, but I can't swear to more probable than not. It's a possibility. And he has

- a shunt placed anyway, so probably not. That's in
 the literature. I don't pick and choose out of
 literature because that's not right. I go ahead and
 print the whole thing, and that's in the literature.
 But he has a VP shunt, so he's probably not going to
 have that, because that's what the VP shunt is
 treating right now.
 - Q. The last, I guess, additional risk that you identify in this paragraph is, he's at a lifetime risk for multiple organ system failure.
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Can you describe that?
 - A. It was in the article.
 - Q. Okay.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

- A. You know, if he's on medications, then you're at risk for complications with your liver or complications with your kidney, because everything's filtered -- all the blood is filtered by the liver and the kidneys.
- Q. Is it fair to say, that if he does suffer from multiple organ system failure, that that would in fact impact his life expectancy?
- A. Yes, but that's a possibility, not a probability.
- 25 Q. What about -- well, I'll go one at a time.

Does traumatically induced epilepsy increase his risk for being hospitalized?

- A. It could increase risk, but it doesn't meet legal threshold of more probable than not.
- Q. Okay. Would your answer be the same for Parkinsonism?
 - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

22

23

24

25

- Q. Would your answer be the same for Alzheimer's-like dementia?
- A. Yes. It's an increased risk probably 10 to 20 percent, but I can't say it's greater than 50 percent. That doesn't meet legal threshold.
 - Q. Okay. Same for hydrocephalus?
- A. Well, I doubt that's going to happen because he already has a shunt.
 - Q. And the same, the multiple organ system failure?
- 18 A. Right. Very low probability.
- Q. Before we move on, let's look at the last page, page 8 of your summary report, which is Exhibit G.

So you state that this patient's future medical care, support services and durable medical equipment are defined in the continuation of care section of this report. This medical necessity and

visits to Disney World, I don't have hyperbaric oxygen, I don't have hippo therapy. I don't have any fluff and puff.

2.2

What's in this report is written in such a way, which I think is a medical necessity to keep this patient as safe as possible. And to make sure there's nothing far reaching in the report and to make sure that there's no hocus pocus in the report, you'll notice, when I write a PRN, it does not meet legal threshold. So this cost is not included in the economic analysis. So if you go to page number 2, basically everything is out where it says PRN. And page number 3, that whole section, diagnostics is out, when it says one time a year/PRN, or PRN.

And when you go to page number 4, I dropped out 1 million to \$4 million -- or, I shouldn't say, I drop out. I don't include 1 million to \$4 million worth of care, 'cause I do make the speculative assumption in this court of law that we live in the perfect world and he'll never have a complication. So I don't include 1 million to \$4 million worth of care. But let's say he does have a complication, such as seizures, has to be admitted, there's no money associated with the admissions to the hospital.

57 well, not die. 1 2 BY MR. HEDGER: 3 So there's not a risk of, you know, Ο. obtaining a staph infection from being admitted into 4 5 the hospital or other hospital? There's always a risk, but it doesn't meet 6 Α. 7 legal threshold of greater than 50 percent 8 probability. 9 0. Okay. 10 Α. And remember, in my thing, it's always risk versus reward. 11 And in the courtroom arena, in order for 12 13 me to say it under oath, it's got to be greater than 14 50 percent probability. 15 While we have your old methodology in 16 front of us, let me just ask you a few questions so 17 we don't waste any time here. 18 So the third paragraph down, it says, "In my medical opinion, that these costs do not take 19 20 into account the costs which are associated with various complications." 21 2.2 Right. And that's in the section that I had that I said, I'm not including 1 million and 23 \$4 million worth of care because I'm going to make 24

this speculative assumption in a court of law that

we live in a perfect world and -- you know, and he's 2 not going to have any problem.

- But these are all complications that he is Ο. at risk for?
- Yeah. But, I mean, he's at risk, but it's not -- doesn't meet anywhere near legal threshold.

(Interruption in the proceedings.)

BY MR. HEDGER:

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- O. All right. Back to what we've marked as Exhibit H. I assume the continuation of care portion is not going to change?
- Α. No, it's not. And you'll notice the cardiology, orthopedic surgeon, gastroenterologist. There's no costs included in an economic analysis because it's a PRN. The neurologist is two to four times a year and PRN. The and PRN is not included. It's only two to four times a year. But I'm not a life care planner, I'm a medical doctor, and that's why I write it this way. This is complete, but yet follows the rules of the court by speculation.
- Do you know the last time -- let's start with neurologist. Do you know the last time he saw a neurologist?
 - Α. I have no idea, but that's irrelevant. What's relevant to me is this is what I

	Dags 00
1	Page 90 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	
3	STATE OF FLORIDA
4	COUNTY OF PALM BEACH
5	
6	I, Shirley D. King, CRR, FPR, RPR, do
7	hereby certify that I was authorized to and did
8	stenographically report the foregoing deposition
9	of CRAIG H. LICHTBLAU, M.D.; that a review of the
10	transcript was requested; and that the transcript
11	is a true record of my stenographic notes.
12	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a
13	relative, employee, attorney, or counsel of any
14	of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee
15	of any of the parties' attorney or counsel
16	connected with the action, nor am I financially
17	interested in the action.
18	Dated this 15th day of April, 2019.
19	$\sim 111111111111111111111111111111111111$
20	Maile VI
21	Markey V. Nay.
22	SHIRLEY D. KING, CRR, FPR, RPR
23	SHIRLEY D. KING, CRR, FPR, RPR
24	